DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 588 IR 008 441

AUTHOR MacVean, Donald S.
TITLE Faculty and Student Participation in University Library Building Planning: A Case History and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Action Research; *Advisory Committees; *Building Design; *College Libraries; Evaluation; Faculty; Higher Education; *Library Facilities; *Library Planning; Students

ABSTRACT

This report is a detailed analysis of a university committee's performance of an important and extensive task--the preparation of a program for a new library building. It is offered in order to clearly show the operations of a university committee, making a qualitative assessment of its performance, and to partially fill a void in the literature on the administration of higher education. The report explores the planning for a new library facility through the formation of a planning committee of students and faculty: a discussion of their qualifications, the operations of the committee, and the contributions of the faculty and student members: an evaluation of their performance: and a review of the literature on the topic. It is concluded in this particular case that the use of the committee was more of a political concession to students and faculty than it was an aid to the actual design of a library: that the committee's performance was weak and its contribution almost nil: and that its existence and involvement did in fact delay the performance of the task at hand by those persons both qualified and interested to perform it. A list of seven references is appended. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188588

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACULTY AND STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY BUILDING PLANNING: A CASE HISTORY AND EVALUATION

by

Donald S. MacVean

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald S. MacVean

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008441

FACULTY AND STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY BUILDING PLANNING: A CASE HISTORY AND EVALUATION

Donald S. Mac Vean
Head Reference Librarian
Western Illinois University
Macomb, IL 61455
March, 1980

Introduction--For many years, and particularly in the last fifteen to twenty, it has been common practice in colleges and universities to use committees to assist administrators and faculty organizations in arriving at decisions on a great variety of matters. Committees are used, in many cases, when the questions or problems faced are of a serious nature, when a considerable amount of data must be collected, studied, and interpreted, and especially when a great deal of time is required to complete the task. In many instances it appears committees are used to do the homework for the administrators or other parent body for lack of time on the part of the latter person or group. Thus, it is a way of sharing the work load imposed on the administration and at the same time involving the faculty (and in some cases, students as well) in decision making, an end they have strongly worked toward in recent years.

There is an extensive literature on faculty and student participation in university governance (see pages 18-19 for a more detailed comment on it), often referred to as "shared governance" or "participatory management," but it is important to note that in examining this literature, no evaluation of the committee system was found. There was much said about why it can be recommended and there were many detailed descriptions of committees

and their functions in various universities. Nowhere, however, was there any evidence of how well they performed their assignments. This report is a detailed analysis and critique of a university committee's performance of an important and extensive task--the preparation of a program for a new library building. It is offered in order to clearly show the operations of a university committee and to make a qualitative assessment of its performance. In both respects, it will partially fill a void in the literature on the administration of higher education.

The place was Western Illinois University where the author was Director of Libraries from 1965-1975 and served as either Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Library Planning Committee during the entire period of its existence from 1969-1975. Sources of information were the agendas and minutes of all meetings, letters of appointment of all members, working papers of the committee, and copies of all correspondence initiated and received by the committee. In addition to what was shown in the minutes, the author added numerous notes to his own copies of the agendas of the meetings, to his appointments calendar, and prepared special memoranda on several occasions. Tapes of some meetings of the committee were also available. All such sources were used in preparing this report.

Early in 1968 the President of the University, despite the fact he had already announced his resignation to be effective in July, was told by the Executive Officer of the Board of Governors to prepare the capital projects schedule for the next decade. Accordingly, all administrative units in the university were asked to prepare requests for new buildings or major expansions or renovations of existing ones, if such were needed within the ten year period.

The library building occupied at the time was only six years old but had a capacity of only 250,000 volumes and seating for 904 persons. When planned in about 1960, the enrollment projection was for only 3,000 students and for only limited graduate course offerings. Thus, the library erected in 1962 was deemed adequate for many years. But by 1965 enrollment had reached 5,000 and by 1968, 8,000. Figures of 23,000-25,000 were projected for the early 1980's.(1:14) Many new Master's degree programs were added and two departments were planning doctoral programs. In light of these developments, it was apparent to the Director as early as 1967 that the present building would be hopelessly inadequate in a very short time. Since it was unexpandable and was not centrally located on the campus, a totally new building would be needed. Thus, in response to the President's directive, the Director, working with a small Library faculty committee, prepared such a request along with a detailed justification. This was defended before the President and a campus-wide committee which considered such requests and assigned priorities and dates for funding. Of the numerous requests submitted, the one for the library was approved, given third priority, and assigned to the 1971-72 biennium for funding.

Formation of the Committee--When the new President assumed office on July 1, 1968 he found the building schedule for the next ten years already completed. He shared the feeling of need for a new library and on one occasion said he would have raised its priority if that had been possible. Within a few months after his arrival, he held several conversations with the Director about the new building and early in 1969 informed him that detailed planning for it must begin. The Director proposed that a small Library faculty committee, the Facilities Planning Officer (a graduate

architect), and the Director himself prepare a program for the new building.* The President agreed that a written program should be prepared, but he did not accept the Director's proposal for formation of the committee. Instead, he said the committee would be appointed by him and would be made up of two faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences and one from each of the other five colleges (to be nominated by the Dean in each case), four students who would be nominated by the Student Government Association Executive Committee, and the Director of Libraries. The latter person would serve as chairman. The Director questioned the advisability of having students serve on the committee. It was pointed out that at the earliest it would be three years and probably four before the new building would be completed. None of the students appointed now would be here then. The turnover in the student membership and the resulting lack of continuity could be a problem because of the frequent need to orient new members to the task. He also urged that there be library faculty members, in addition to the Director, on the committee. This was said for several reasons. First, the Director had a full time and very taxing job with his regular day to day duties. Building planning would be very time consuming and assistants would have to do at least a part of the detailed work. Second, he was concerned that the committee was overbalanced with non-library faculty, none of whom had any expertise in librarianship. The fear was that such a group could, through ignorance, limit the effectiveness of the com-

*A building program is a written description of a building's functions and space needs. Usually it is an extensive and reasonably detailed statement because it is from this document that the architect prepares the designs and schematics. Much time can be saved and confusion avoided later if the program clearly expresses what is desired in the new building.

mittee. Or, if so inclined, since it had a numerical majority, it could vote unwise decisions. But these arguments were not heeded by the President and the committee was organized in the manner just outlined. He did add, however, that the Director could continue to use a library faculty committee for the detailed work, but that all its proposals would have to be approved by the Committee he appointed.

Qualifications of Committee Members--Only the Director (Chairman) had had any experience in library building planning and that was limited to the preliminary stages of an addition to the university library on another campus. One member had written a program for the School of Education building and another considered himself an architectural historian. The latter person had expressed a keen interest in the design of the building, particularly the external features. None of the other members had any special qualifications for this assignment but it was clear that all, students as well as faculty, were convinced of the need for a new building and approached the task with some interest.

Operation of the Committee--The committee held its first meeting on December 5, 1969. At this meeting it was explained that the task was to write a program for a new library building. Programs obtained from more than twenty institutions were offered as examples and other documents useful in planning a new library were distributed. These consisted of the request presented to the university council which authorized the project, the enrollment projection for the university, the latest report of the university Long Range Planning Project(2), the recent report of the Library Committee of the Illinois Board of Higher Education(3), and several textbooks or manuals on library planning(4). All members were encouraged to read these documents as soon as possible.

Several important decisions were made at this initial meeting. First, that the proposals regarding the new library building would be welcomed from anyone, whether a committee member or not, but they must be presented in writing. This was done in order to insure that they could be thoroughly studied and understood before action on them was taken. Second, that the detailed work necessary to provide the factual part of the building program would be done by the Library faculty committee (called the Physical Rearrangements Committee) and submitted to this committee as a draft or recommendation. The committee members were unaware that there were detailed formulas for determining building space requirements on the basis on enrollments, for calculating spaces for readers, for library staff, and for collections. When the members became aware, partly from scanning the programs from other institutions, of the large number of detailed analyses and calculations that would have to be made, they welcomed this assistance, especially so since the target date for completion of the program had been set for May, 1970.

The committee decided to meet bi-weekly until the program was completed, with examination and vacation periods excepted. For a variety of reasons, this schedule was departed from numerous times, but in the early months the meetings were held quite regularly.

After several meetings it was apparent to the Director that the other members were making little progress in comprehending the written materials given to them and that no proposals had been submitted by them. Therefore, he again expressed his concern to the President about the make-up of the committee and the lack of response from the members. The President reiterated his earlier remarks to the effect that the in-house or Library Physical Rearrangements Committee and the Director would have to do the detailed

work, write the program and explain and defend it before the parent committee. He didn't offer to change the membership of the latter group. He did agree, however, to have the chairman of Physical Rearrangements Committee serve as secretary of the other group. This relieved the Director of serving in this capacity as well as Chairman.

Early in its deliberations the committee decided it should employ a consultant to critique the program and advise on several matters. This was agreed to by the University Administration and the funds were made available. The committee spent parts of two meetings discussing the matter and finally selected a person. He was to be invited to the campus after the draft of the program was completed.

The members also thought they would benefit if they could visit some recently completed university library buildings. There were many of these in the nation and during the spring and summer of 1970, ten committee members, students as well as faculty, visited ten libraries located in various parts of the midwest, south, and southwest. Again, the central administration was willing to fund the costs.

By the time of the third meeting on January 12, 1970 the Physical Rearrangements Committee had produced and the Director had submitted to the Library Planning Committee the first part of the program statement. Probably at this point it is in order to describe a building program in greater detail. It is important to do so in light of what will be said later about the problems of interpretation and comprehension within the committee. The following brief outline will show the major contents:

Introduction

History of the Library
- A. Projection of Enrollment and Faculty Growth
- B. Growth of the Library Collections (volumes)
- C. Projected Growth of the Collections, 1970-1980

Summary of Space Requirements for the New Library Building
- A. For Books
- B. For Staff
- C. For Readers

Organizational Pattern and Internal Spatial Relationships of the Library Building
- A. Building Concepts
- B. Building Construction Features
- C. Schedule of Space Requirements, Broken Down by Areas

Description of Individual Areas
- A. Public Service Areas
- B. Technical Service Areas
- C. Administrative Areas

Appendicies
- A. Breakdown of Projected Staff
- B. Position Papers
  1. Subject Divisional vs. Functional Arrangement
  2. Student Study Habits and Preferences
  3. The Impact of Technology on the Library Building (with Addendum)

As mentioned earlier, the program provides the architect with the information needed to prepare the detailed drawings for the building. Thus, the estimates of the space required for the various functions must be reasonably accurate. Also, internal spatial relationships must be clearly shown so there will be a logical arrangement of the service areas within the building. This is important in order to insure convenience and efficiency of use by both patrons and library staff. It is not the purpose of the program, however, to suggest or control design features. This task is better left to the architect whose special talents are employed specifically for this purpose.

The space requirements for such things as books, staff, and readers were not difficult to calculate. There are well known and widely used formulas for determining them found in Metcalf's(4) text as well as other sources, many of which were used extensively in the planning process. These facts were not difficult for the committee to understand and they readily accepted them except for the amount of space assigned for seating and the type of seating provided. Here the faculty members wanted far more carrells than could be justified and the students wanted fewer. The opposition of the latter group was based on the fact that such seats were to be reserved for graduate students and faculty. Since all the student members of the committee were undergraduates, some of them thought the provision of special facilities solely for other groups to be discriminatory. Neither of these points proved to be serious obstacles, however, and the initial space allotments for materials, for library personnel, and for patrons were made much in accord with the earlier mentioned formulas. The only exception was the space assigned for patrons or readers. Metcalf's text recommends seating for 33% of the student body. In this program, however, the figure was reduced, first to 25% and later to 20%, because it is well known that in state universities which have numerous curricula in applied subjects at the undergraduate level, library use by students is less intensive than in Liberal Arts Colleges and in institutions having large graduate enrollments.

From the first through fifth meeting (from December, 1969-February, 1970) there were few operational problems within the committee other than some irregularity of attendance and a lack of responsiveness on the part of the faculty and student members. As pointed out earlier, the draft of the program was prepared by the Physical Rearrangements Committee and sub-

mitted to the larger committee for discussion and approval or rejection. The proposals were accepted with only minor changes.

For the sake of brevity and simplicity, when writing the program rhetoric was kept to a minimum, and wherever possible facts and figures were presented in tabular form. There were, however, several issues that could not be treated in such a manner but rather had to be thoroughly researched and reported on in detail. Examples were: (1) the need, or lack thereof, for differentiated collections and facilities for undergraduates and graduates, (2) whether to divide the collections by form or type, and (3) the effects of the new and growing technology on library operations. Since each of these subjects had numerous ramifications, was often controversial, and had a broad literature base, it was impossible to describe them in the few paragraphs which was the standard adopted for the program. In order to give fuller expression to these ideas they were formed into essays of about four typewritten pages each and offered as addenda to the program under the heading of "position papers."

With the introduction of the position papers, real difficulty within the committee developed. Although they were written largely in nontechnical language, the members had great difficulty understanding them, with the faculty showing only slightly more comprehension than the students. For some reason they found them to be quite forbidding. The papers which were most troublesome dealt with (1) undergraduate and graduate facilities and collections, and (2) subject divisional vs. functional arrangement of collections and staff services. In brief, the idea contained in the first was that in large libraries, which this one was destined to become, the undergraduate cannot function effectively. Handicapped by inexperience and

weak in knowledge of resources and research tools, he wastes a great deal of time in locating what is needed. To solve this problem many large institutions have in the past thirty years built either a separate undergraduate library or assigned part of the general library building for this purpose. In either case, such space housed a separate collection of 20,000 to 100,000 titles closely related to undergraduate course offerings. Another feature of the undergraduate library was an increased amount of professional staff assistance in order to assist the inexperienced searcher. Based on reports from other institutions, this new type of facility had been satisfactory depite somewhat higher costs of operation. As far as is known, however, only one university had abandoned it for this reason.

As proposed in the position paper, the undergraduate collection would be in the central library and initially would have only 20,000-30,000 volumes based largely on the collection developed at Northwestern University where it was designated as the "core collection."(5) These books, all duplicates of titles in the larger collection, would not circulate and thus always be available. Undergraduates would not be confined to this section of the building but would have access to the other collections as well. But despite the numerous advantages stated, this proposal received little support from either students or faculty members on the committee. There was some objection to it on the basis of added expense but again the students saw in it something designed to limit their free use of the total facility. One faculty member thought it would impose a permanent inflexibility in space utilization. Neither point had any basis in fact, but the committee couldn't be persuaded on the issue and this proposal was voted down.

In the second position paper, the one that debated the subject division vs. functional arrangement, the basic question was whether printed materials would be organized by form, i.e., books, periodicals, government publications, microforms, and pamphlets in distinct collections or, the format be ignored, and the collections divided into four broad subject groupings, as follows: (1) humanities, (2) social sciences, (3) sciences, and (4) psychology and education. There were about an equal number of arguments on each side and all were given, but the paper did state a definite preference for the division by form (or function) because of the savings in cost, particularly for staff and duplicate materials. It was the student members of the committee who were most oblique in this instance. The basic problem was not a difference of opinions but a lack of understanding of either side of the issue. Although the paper was clearly written and several hours were devoted to discussing it, it was unintelligible to them.

It should be explained at this point that the four students appointed to the committee initially had now left the campus and replacements had come on. It also should be mentioned that these appointments were made by the Student Government Association, the student political agency on the campus, and that the time (1970) was one of considerable student militancy. It was mild on this campus compared to some, but it was in evidence and the attitude of the new group on the committee reflected suspicion, recalcitrance, and at times obstructionism. The students were appointed to the committee because of their political activity, not because of any knowledge of libraries.

When no progress toward an understanding of the issues involved had been made after two sessions, the second position paper was withdrawn on

the grounds that the matter could be treated as an operational problem rather than one of building design and, therefore, need not be settled by the committee.

When the discussion of the position papers was concluded and action on them taken (two accepted, one defeated, and one withdrawn) the committee's important task was finished. The entire building program was transmitted to the university's central administration and in turn to the Board of Governors. It received approval at both levels. The Illinois Board of Higher Education later reduced the space allotment by 25,000 square feet. This action necessitated some modification in the program but the committe was only peripherally involved. This occurred in 1972. The committee remained in existence until 1975, with numerous changes in membership, but there were few meetings during the last three years. The reason for this long period of relative inactivity was the delay in funding the project. On two occasions the Governor withheld or cancelled the planning funds (the money needed to have the architects' drawings prepared) and the General Assembly failed to appropriate the building funds until 1974. When construction began in 1975, oversight of the project became the responsibility of university administrative officials and the project director, an appointee of the Illinois Capital Development Board. There was no further need for a planning committee.

Contributions of Faculty and Student Members--As mentioned in the introduction, the main purpose of this report was to show what contributions, if any, the faculty and student members made toward accomplishing the committee's task--the writing of a program for a new library building. It is important that this be done when assessing the committee's performance.

Mentioned earlier was the fact that, at the start of its proceedings, the committee ruled that all substantive proposals must be offered in writing and would be received from anyone. Actually, however, only two proposals came from committee members and both were from faculty members. None was received from the student members. The first one presented could scarcely be called a proposal, however, because it was so lacking in detail. The main concern was to speak in favor of multiple entrances to the building for the sake of convenience for the patrons. This was in conflict with the proposed program which provided for only one public entrance in order to provide better control of the collections and to save space. Actually, the new building has three public entrances, not because of the efforts of this person, but rather due to the decision of the state project officer, whose decision was final. It has, however, brought bad results. Not only is security of the collections seriously weakened, but also a great deal of space has been preempted for corridors and for elevated ceilings which reduced the space on the floors immediately above. The second proposal made by a faculty member favored a centralized microform collection and special area for servicing them. This had great merit and occupied considerable time of the committee. Microforms had long been a problem in the present library due to lack of space, seating, poor equipment and the lack of proper maintenance. After thorough consideration, however, it was found that microforms could not be centralized, despite certain advantages, because to do so would break up parts of both the Periodicals and Government Publications collections. If only certain titles in toto had been affected, it could have been managed, but in both cases, parts of certain titles were in paper and other parts in microform, and it was deemed unwise to separate them. Therefore, this proposal was voted down.

Evaluation--During the period of more than five years of its existence the committee held twenty-two meetings of about two hours each. Thirteen teaching faculty members and eleven students served on the committee at one time or another. Despite the considerable amount of time spent in meetings and the involvement of a large number of persons, very little was contributed by the group, as was shown above. Proposals were submitted by only two persons, only one of which had any merit. This failure to make more than a minimal contribution would appear to be due to lack of time or an unwillingness to study the references provided as well as an inability to comprehend the conceptual and technical issues involved. Turnover in membership, particularly of students, only intensified these weaknesses. Taken together they caused delay in completion of the program. Probably it could have been done in half the time if the members had been more knowledgeable of library matters and willing to devote some hours to individual study of the issues.

In light of the rather obvious conclusions just mentioned, most important questions arise: Why was a committee used for this task and why was it structured as it was? To an extent, these questions were answered earlier when it was mentioned that they were Presidential decisions in both cases and no rationale was offered. It should be added, however, that there was precedent on this campus and elsewhere for using committees for planning campus buildings. The President also appointed numerous committees to deal with other matters and encouraged other administrators to do likewise. It came to a point where practically no decisions were made until after some committee or other had made recommendations. Why this preoccupation with committees? In hindsight it is clear that it was an adroit way to disarm critics if decisions proved unpopular. In such instances it could be said

they were based on committee recommendations. Also, since the late 1960's and early 1970's were tense times on campuses and both faculty and student groups were pressing for more "involvement" or participation in decision making, appointing committees or permitting them to proliferate was an easy way to grant it. In addition to the desire to participate in what was perceived as decision making, the faculty members had other reasons for seeking committee assignments. In some instances such assignments brought considerable visibility to them on campus and thus a great deal of ego satisfaction. Also, committee membership and service counted heavily in the annual faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion and thus many faculty members sought such assignments. There were numerous examples of persons who hadn't authored a single scholarly publication but who had risen to the rank of full professor on the basis of their committee activity. It also should be said that the President was a very politically oriented person. He not only had a degree in Political Science, he had served in a state legislature as well. Most legislative bodies make heavy use of committees and apparently the President accepted this practice as a model.

Even though committees had been used previously for planning campus buildings, as far as is known this committee and the one that planned the library constructed in 1962 were the only ones on which all colleges were represented and the only ones on which the faculty most directly affected was given minority representation. As mentioned earlier, the President would permit only the Director of Libraries to serve on the committee. The College of Arts and Sciences had two representatives, each other college had one, and the student body had four. Why the underrepresentation of the Library Faculty? The President never spoke to this point but implicit in

his decision was agreement with the ideas contained in the often heard remarks that the library is an "all-university facility" and "the library is too important to be left to the librarians." The first remark is true to the extent that the library has the potential for serving all faculty and students but the assumption that it is used by all of either or both groups is one of the myths of the academic world. In a study(6:6-7) done on this campus in 1978, using data for 1974-75, it was shown that 42.2 per cent of the faculty didn't use the library at all. No such reliable figures for students are available, but a study of attendance statistics suggests that probably no more than 60 per cent of them use the library during any one year. But false beliefs persist in academia as elsewhere, and, in the case of this one, librarians deplore the fact at times but support it at others. When the budget request is to be acted upon they hope the President does believe that all faculty members and students use the library.

The second quoted remark that "the library is too important to be left to the librarians" reveals a lack of confidence in and in some instances a distrust of librarians by faculty members and administrators. This is widespread and exists for several reasons. First, some faculty members believe the education of librarians to be inferior to their own. Second, they will argue that since they have used a library intensively during some period in their academic careers they know how a library should be administered. The author was the Director of Libraries for ten years and was frequently confronted by persons with this attitude. They were usually very conceited, egotistical persons and, in some instances, persons who's desires for administrative assignments had been frustrated. It also must be remembered that the library has one of the largest budgets on the campus and some

faculty members and administrators keenly resent this fact and hope to find ways to control its expenditure.

Since the performance of the Library Building Committee was shown to be largely a failure and a waste of time for all concerned, what structured procedure or process can be recommended as practicable for planning such a facility, one that will be used by a great many students and faculty, and one that probably is the most expensive building on the campus? (This new library cost $12.5 million or almost twice what any other campus building cost, unadjusted for inflation). The recommended procedure would be that the Director, an Assistant Director, or a senior library faculty member lead the planning effort and work closely with a professional consultant and an architect. Such a team could work much more rapidly and effectively than was the case here. Three to four months, or one-third the time required when using a committee, should be adequate to prepare a program. Simple sketches could also be prepared. Then at this point both program and sketches could be shown to any interested faculty members and students who, in turn, could write a critique. Only the serious ones would go to this length and something useful might be gained. The mere curious, the busybodies, and the campus politicans probably would not make this effort but they would be silenced because they would have had their opportunity. Such a system would keep faculty members and students, whether intentionally or not, from delaying or interfering with the progress in planning and yet they could have a part in it if they wished. It should be recognized that there is little point in employing consultants and architects and investing a great deal of librarians time in planning only to have their work delayed or even undone by the inertia or mischief of

what is essentially a group of lay persons as far as such matters are concerned.

Review of the literature--A thorough search of the literature was made, manually of the bibliography of books and Education Index, and online of the ERIC data base. As noted earlier (page 1) there is an extensive literature in periodical form on faculty and student participation in college and university administration which was located by use of the Education Index. But not a single book, article, or report of any kind that described faculty and student participation in library building planning was found.

Thus, the available literature is only peripherally related to this study. Of the large number of articles which described faculty and student participation in university governance, all were supportive of the idea but they dealt with the concept in general terms, with few examples given. It seems doubtful that support would be indicated for such a specialized, detailed, and technical task as planning a library or any other building.

In addition to monographic and journal literature, a search was made for official policy statements of academic and professional associations which might bear on this subject. The only one found was that jointly formulated in 1966 by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges entitled "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." In this statement the following paragraph appears:

> A second area calling for joint effort in internal operations is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.(7:41)

It is not known how strictly this statement is to be interpreted, i.e., whether the faculty would be involved only in assigning priorities for construction and perhaps location of buildings or whether they should be directly involved in the planning as they were in this instrance. In any event, this was the only policy statement found relating to the subject.

Conclusions--The use of committees comprised of faculty and/or students is widespread in colleges and universities. The purpose or charge of such committees varies greatly and includes policy making of all sorts, planning special events, assisting in personnel decisions, and, as in the case described in this report, the responsibility for performing very specialized and technical tasks such as preparing a program for a new library building. The literature review confirmed this broad involvement of committees in the administration of higher education but no reports of evaluation of the practice were found. In fact, it would be difficult to show, based on the literature, why it was done other than it was a concession to pressure from faculty members and students for involvement or participation in decision making. To avoid conflict with such groups may be a worthy objective in terms of life saving for the administration but it behooves someone to show that it has positive values over and beyond this. In the case described here, the committee's performance was weak and its contribution almost nil. The committee's existence and involvement did,

in fact, delay the performance of the task at hand by those persons both qualified and interested enough to perform it.

REFERENCES

1. Western Illinois University. Office of University Planning. The Decade Ahead. Macomb, IL, 1970. 83pp.

2. Western Illinois University. The Decade Ahead; Academic, Administrative and Physical Plan. Macomb, 1975. vii, 128pp.

3. Illinois Board of Higher Education. Report of the Library Committee. Springfield, IL, 1969. iv, 60pp.

4. Ellsworth, Ralph E., "Buildings." In The State of the Library Art, vol. III, pt. 1, ed. by Ralph R. Shaw. New Brunswick, N.J., Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers--The State University, 1960. pp. 1-151; Ellsworth, Ralph E. Planning Manual for Academic Library Buildings. Matuchen, N.J., The Scarecrow Press, 1973. xiv, 159pp.; Metcalf, Keyes D. Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings. New York, McGraw--Hill Book Company, 1965. xv, 431pp.

5. Horney, Karen. "Building Northwestern's Core." Library Journal 96:1580-1584, May 1, 1971.

6. Mac Vean, Donald S. Faculty Use of a University Library Circulating Book Collection. Arlington, VA, EDRS, 1978. 22pp. (Ed 157 561).

7. "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." In The American Association of University Professors. Policy Documents and Reports. Washington, D.C., The Association, 1977. pp. 40-44.